

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TYRONE JOSEPH PORTEE,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-1414-EPG

FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER
REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S SOCIAL
SECURITY COMPLAINT

(ECF No. 23, 26)

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Tyrone Joseph Portee ("Plaintiff") complaint for judicial review of an unfavorable decision by the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration. The parties have consented to entry of final judgment by a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), with any appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. (ECF Nos. 7, 9-10).

The matter was taken under submission on the parties' briefs without a hearing. Having reviewed the record, the administrative transcript, the parties' briefs, and the applicable law, the Court finds as follows.

///

///

///

I. DISCUSSION

Plaintiff makes the following arguments:

1. The ALJ erred by rejecting the opinion from Dr. Wagner without proper evaluation; and
2. The ALJ failed to include work-related limitations in the RFC consistent with the nature and intensity of Plaintiff's limitations, and failed to offer legitimate reasons for rejecting Plaintiff's subjective limitations.

A. Dr. Wagner's medical opinion

This claim is governed by the agency's "new" regulations concerning how ALJs must evaluate medical opinions for claims filed on or after March 27, 2017.¹ 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520c, 416.920c; (ECF No. 19, p. 17; ECF No. 22, pp. 4-5). The regulations set "supportability" and "consistency" as "the most important factors" when determining the opinions' persuasiveness. 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520c(b)(2), 416.920c(b)(2). And although the regulations eliminate the "physician hierarchy," deference to specific medical opinions, and assigning "weight" to a medical opinion, the ALJ must still "articulate how [he or she] considered the medical opinions" and "how persuasive [he or she] find[s] all of the medical opinions." 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520c(a)-(b); 416.920c(a)-(b).

Recently, the Ninth Circuit has issued the following guidance regarding treatment of physicians' opinions after implementation of the revised regulations:

The revised social security regulations are clearly irreconcilable with our caselaw according special deference to the opinions of treating and examining physicians on account of their relationship with the claimant. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520c(a) ("We will not defer or give any specific evidentiary weight, including controlling weight, to any medical opinion(s) . . . , including those from your medical sources."). Our requirement that ALJs provide "specific and legitimate reasons" for rejecting a treating or examining doctor's opinion, which stems from the special weight given to such opinions, *see Murray*, 722 F.2d at 501–02, is likewise incompatible with the revised regulations. Insisting that ALJs provide a more robust explanation when discrediting evidence from certain sources necessarily favors the evidence from those sources—contrary to the revised regulations.

Woods v. Kijakazi, No. 21-35458, 2022 WL 1195334, at *6 (9th Cir. Apr. 22, 2022).

Accordingly, under the new regulations, "the decision to discredit any medical opinion, must

¹ Plaintiff applied for disability benefits on August 10, 2017.

1 simply be supported by substantial evidence.” *Id.* at *1. “Substantial evidence means more than a
 2 scintilla but less than a preponderance.” *Thomas v. Barnhart*, 278 F.3d 947, 954 (9th Cir. 2002).
 3 It is “relevant evidence which, considering the record as a whole, a reasonable person might
 4 accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Id.*

5 In conjunction with this requirement, “[t]he agency must ‘articulate . . . how persuasive’
 6 it finds ‘all of the medical opinions’ from each doctor or other source, 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520c(b),
 7 and ‘explain how [it] considered the supportability and consistency factors’ in reaching these
 8 findings, *id.* § 404.1520c(b)(2).” *Woods*, 2022 WL 1195334, at *6.

9 Supportability means the extent to which a medical source supports the medical
 10 opinion by explaining the “relevant . . . objective medical evidence.” *Id.*
 11 § 404.1520c(c)(1). Consistency means the extent to which a medical opinion is
 “consistent . . . with the evidence from other medical sources and nonmedical
 sources in the claim.” *Id.* § 404.1520c(c)(2).

12 *Id.*

13 As the Ninth Circuit also noted, “The revised regulations recognize that a medical
 14 source’s relationship with the claimant is still relevant when assessing the persuasiveness of the
 15 source’s opinion. *See id.* § 404.1520c(c)(3). Thus, an ALJ can still consider the length and
 16 purpose of the treatment relationship, the frequency of examinations, the kinds and extent of
 17 examinations that the medical source has performed or ordered from specialists, and whether the
 18 medical source has examined the claimant or merely reviewed the claimant’s records. *Id.* §
 19 404.1520c(c)(3)(i)–(v). However, the ALJ no longer needs to make specific findings regarding
 20 these relationship factors.” *Woods*, 2022 WL 1195334, at *6 (citing § 404.1520c(b)(2)). “A
 21 discussion of relationship factors may be appropriate when ‘two or more medical opinions . . .
 22 about the same issue are . . . equally well-supported . . . and consistent with the record . . . but are
 23 not exactly the same.’ *Id.* § 404.1520c(b)(3). In that case, the ALJ ‘will articulate how [the
 agency] considered the other most persuasive factors.’” *Id.*

24 With these legal standards in mind, the Court reviews the ALJ’s weight given to the 2020
 25 medical opinion of Dr. Wagner:

26 On January 4, 2020, the claimant underwent an internal medicine evaluation with
 27 Roger Wagner, M.D. at the request of the agency. The claimant reported his chief
 28 complaints were stroke and hypertension. The claimant reported a stroke in 2013
 followed by three weeks of rehabilitation for left sided hemiparesis which “has

1 improved some.” He reported complete vision loss in the right eye at that time, and
2 he had some dysarthria, which resolved, and some dysphagia. He reported that he
3 still had some slight problems with thin liquids. The claimant complained of
4 mild memory problems and cognitive slowing, and he reported that he has balance
5 problems, and occasionally trips. He reported chronic kidney disease for which he
6 sees a nephrologists. He reported glaucoma in the left eye with vision loss in the
7 right eye, and he follows up with his eye doctor every three to six months. The
8 claimant reported he does little cooking or cleaning. He goes shopping, and
9 performs his own activities of daily living but he does not have a driver’s
10 license (Exhibit 13F, pp. 2-3).

11 On physical examination, the claimant was able to get up from a chair in the
12 waiting room and walk “at a somewhat slow speed” back to the examination room
13 without assistance. Dr. Wagner noted the claimant did not need to reach out to the
14 wall to ambulate and was able to walk in the correct door, and it in the correct
15 chair based on verbal commands. He sat comfortably and was able to get on and
16 off the examination table and remove his footwear. He was able to pick up a
17 paperclip. His blood pressure was 150/98. Visual acuity with Snellen’s test was
18 20/100 on the left without lenses and 20/200 on the left with pinhole. On the right,
19 the claimant could not see the top line of the chart and he had no light perception.
20 Pupil reactivity on the right was very decreased, and there appeared to be a
21 cataract on the right. The claimant’s gait and station was normal, he was able to
22 walk on heels and toes, finger to nose was normal, and Romberg was negative. He
23 did not use an assistive device. Range of motion in his cervical and lumbar spine
24 was within normal limits, and straight leg raising was negative in the supine and
25 sitting positions.

26 Range of motion in the claimant’s hips, shoulders, and upper and lower extremities
27 was within normal limits. Muscle strength was 5/5 in the right upper and lower
28 extremities, and 5-/5 in the left upper and lower extremities (Exhibit 13F, pp. 4-5).
Dr. Wagner assessed a stroke in 2013 with apparent immediate vision loss in the
right side, and left hemiparesis and he still had some mild left sided weakness. He
noted the claimant described some very mild dysphagia of liquids and some mild
memory and cognitive problems. He assessed hypertension with chronic kidney
disease and glaucoma in the left eye. Dr. Wagner opined the claimant could stand
and walk up to four hours “given the history of the stroke and slight weakness.”
He could lift and carry 11-20 pounds occasionally and up to ten pounds frequently
due to the history of the stroke. He was limited to frequent postural activities with
the exception of stairs and ramps, which may be performed occasionally with
limitations due to history of stroke and slight left sided weakness. He should not
climb ladders and scaffolds, or balance given the balance problems. He could
operate foot pedals frequently with the left foot.

He opined the claimant should nor work around unprotected heights, moving parts,
or operate a vehicle given the vision problems (Exhibit 13F, pp. 6-9). I note in the
boilerplate residual functional capacity form Dr. Wagner opined the claimant
could frequently climb ramps and stairs, stoop, and crouch, and occasionally climb

1 ladders, ropes or scaffolds due to low back and knee pain, and he could frequently
2 operate a motor vehicle (Exhibit 13F, pp. 10-11).

3 For the reasons stated above, I have not found Dr. Wagner's January 4, 2020
4 opinion persuasive, as while supported by his examination findings, the
5 information given to him by the claimant is not consistent with his reports to his
6 primary care providers in the record, and Dr. Wagner's examination findings of
7 left sided strength deficits are not consistent with the multiple physical
8 examination findings documented in the record as discussed above. I also note Dr.
9 Wagner's finding of 20/100 vision in the claimant's left eye is not consistent with
10 the claimant's ophthalmologist, Dr. Poulsen's July 9, 2019 uncorrected visual
11 acuity finding 20/60 in the right eye. Furthermore as this opinion is a year remote
12 to the claimant's date last insured and finds only trace deficits, which are not
13 supported by the objective record as of the date last insured, this opinion cannot be
14 relied upon as of the date last insured. Had the findings concluded there were
15 greater or differing deficits from those found in the record, it might relate back to
16 the date last insured, but this is not the case. Overall, outside of the opinion at
17 (13F) the record suggests full motor and coordination and is supportive of the State
18 agency disability consultant's findings, at least as remote as the date last insured.

19 (A.R. 22-23, 24).

20 Notably, Dr. Wagner's 2020 opinion is contradicted by Dr. Wagner's own earlier opinion
21 from November 2017, as well as the opinion of state agency medical consultants. In Dr.
22 Wagner's earlier opinion dated November 6, 2017, he opined that Plaintiff could stand and walk
23 "up to six hours with normal breaks," could lift "50 pounds occasionally and 25 pounds
24 frequently," and had no postural limitations. The ALJ found Dr. Wagner's earlier opinion
25 persuasive, stating:

26 Dr. Wagner's November 6, 2017 opinion, though not entirely consistent with the
27 record as the claimant reported balance, memory, and concentration issues that he
28 did not report to his primary care provider, Dr. Wagner's examination findings are
more consistent with the claimant's primary care provider examination findings,
and his opinion is supported by both the record and his examination findings.
Accordingly, I find this opinion to be persuasive.

(A.R. 24).

In evaluating the ALJ's reasons to discount Dr. Wagner's 2020 opinion, it is worth noting
that the ALJ incorporated the workplace environmental activities from Dr. Wagner's 2020
opinion and included substantial limitations regarding Plaintiff's vision. (A.R. 16 ("He is capable
of performing jobs that can be performed with monocular vision, but is not able to perform jobs
requiring the reading of fine print. He should not work in jobs subjecting him to direct sunlight,

1 or which exposes him to unprotected heights of machinery with dangerous moving mechanical
 2 parts.”). What the ALJ declined to adopt were the increased limitations to standing, walking,
 3 lifting, and carrying from Dr. Wagner’s more recent opinion.

4 As for the ALJ’s reason that Dr. Wagner’s 2017 opinion was more consistent with the
 5 primary care provider examination findings than Dr. Wagner’s 2020 opinion, although the ALJ
 6 does not cite to any records in this discussion section, the ALJ did an extensive summary of
 7 medical records earlier in the opinion, which included various relatively normal examination
 8 findings, except for Plaintiff’s vision. For example, a review of medical records by Dr. Patel,
 9 who was the primary care physician for at least a substantial amount of time under review,
 10 support the ALJ’s reason here. Plaintiff did not report balance, memory, and concentration issues
 11 with Dr. Patel. *See e.g.*, A.R. 308 (“Neurological: No dizziness, numbness, weakness or seizure
 12 activity.”); A.R. 309 (“Encounter for general adult medical examination without abnormal
 13 findings.”). It is also true, as the ALJ stated, that “Dr. Wagner’s finding of 20/100 vision in the
 14 claimant’s left eye is not consistent with the claimant’s ophthalmologist, Dr. Poulsen’s July 9,
 15 2019 uncorrected visual acuity finding 20/60 in the right eye.” (A.R. 377). Although again, the
 16 ALJ incorporated substantial limits to Plaintiff’s vision in the RFC.

17 The ALJ’s reason of preferring the earlier to the later opinion of Dr. Wagner is also
 18 legitimate. Here, the later opinion was after the date last insured. While this alone would not be
 19 sufficient to disregard the opinion, it is a relevant consideration especially as the same doctor
 20 performed an earlier evaluation within the relevant period.

21 Accordingly, the Court finds that the ALJ’s reasons for the weight given to Dr. Wagner’s
 22 2020 opinion are legally sufficient and supported by substantial evidence.

23 **B. Subjective Symptom Testimony**

24 Plaintiff also challenges the ALJ’s weight given to Plaintiff’s subjective symptom
 25 testimony. Regarding this issue, the Ninth Circuit has provided the following guidance:

26 To determine whether a claimant’s testimony regarding subjective pain or
 27 symptoms is credible, an ALJ must engage in a two-step analysis. First, the ALJ
 28 must determine whether the claimant has presented objective medical evidence of
 an underlying impairment which could reasonably be expected to produce the pain
 or other symptoms alleged. The claimant, however, need not show that her
 impairment could reasonably be expected to cause the severity of the symptom she
 has alleged; she need only show that it could reasonably have caused some degree

1 of the symptom. Thus, the ALJ may not reject subjective symptom testimony ...
2 simply because there is no showing that the impairment can reasonably produce
the degree of symptom alleged.

3 Second, if the claimant meets this first test, and there is no evidence of
4 malingering, the ALJ can reject the claimant's testimony about the severity of her
symptoms only by offering specific, clear and convincing reasons for doing so[.]

5 *Lingenfelter v. Astrue*, 504 F.3d 1028, 1035-36 (9th Cir. 2007) (citations and quotation marks
6 omitted). In weighing a claimant's credibility, an ALJ may consider, among other things, the
7 claimant's reputation for truthfulness, inconsistencies either in the claimant's testimony or
8 between her testimony and her conduct, the claimant's daily activities, her work record, and
9 testimony from physicians and third parties concerning the nature, severity, and effect of the
10 claimant's symptoms. *Thomas v. Barnhart*, 279 F.3d 947, 958-59 (9th Cir. 2002) (citation
11 omitted). If the ALJ's credibility finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record, the
12 Court "may not engage in second-guessing." *Id.*

13 The ALJ found as follows regarding Plaintiff's subjective symptom testimony:

14 As for the claimant's statements about the intensity, persistence, and limiting
15 effects of his or her symptoms, they are inconsistent because the overall record
16 does confirm the claimant had a stroke event in April of 2013, but the record
17 shows full strength and motor function by the time he saw primary care provider
18 Ashley Johnson, FNP on April 24, 2013. I note Ms. Johnson noted the claimant's
19 wife reported he was seen at Saint Agnes Medical Center for a mild stroke "on
20 Monday." The claimant denied "having any kind of disability whatsoever." He
21 denied malaise, fatigue, night sweats, blurred vision, double vision, photophobia,
22 visual changes, glaucoma, and he did not wear glasses. He denied any sensation of
23 room spinning, dyspnea, orthopnea, shortness of breath, weakness, migraine
24 headache, and loss of balance. He reported decrease in cognitive skills, and he
25 denied any symptoms of paralysis, or difficulty concentrating. The claimant was
26 assessed with vomiting, malignant hypertension, and transient ischemic attack
27 without residual deficits (Exhibit 2F, pp. 24-26). The claimant's April 24, 2013
28 primary care provider documentation is not consistent with the claimant's January
4, 2020 report to Dr. Wagner that he was hospitalized and in rehabilitation for
three weeks (Exhibit 13F, p. 2), and I note the request for medical records sent to
Saint Agnes Medical Providers on September 14, 2017 was returned with notation
that the claimant was "not seen at this facility." (Exhibit 5F).

Furthermore, subsequent primary care provider examination findings, discussed
above in detail, did not reveal any weakness or residual effects of the claimant's
cerebrovascular event, and the claimant denied any weakness, dizziness, shortness

1 of breath, fatigue, or other sequelae repeatedly over the course of the following six
2 years, with any healthcare provider (Exhibits 2F; 3F; 8F; 9F; 10F; 11F; 12F).

3 (A.R. 23-24).

4 The Court has reviewed the cited records and find that they are supportive of the ALJ's
5 reasoning in that they reflect largely normal self-reports and examination findings regarding his
6 strength and motor function. *See* A.R. 270-271 (noting largely unremarkable findings including
7 "The patient denies weakness, convulsions/seizures, numbness, decrease in cognitive skills, loss
8 of balance, head injury, or tremors;"); A.R. 308 ("Patient had stroke in April 2013. He has no
9 deficit now."); A.R. 383 (indicating "negative" results in review of all systems).

10 Accordingly, the Court finds that the ALJ provided sufficient reasons to not fully credit
11 Plaintiff's subjective symptom testimony.

12 **II. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

13 In light of the foregoing, the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is supported
14 by substantial evidence, and the same is hereby affirmed.

15 The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: May 23, 2022

18 /s/ Eric P. Grogan
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28